

REMARKS

Claims 1-33 were pending. Claims 1-27 have been amended. Claims 28-33 have been cancelled. The specification has been amended to correct minor informalities. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-27 remain pending in the present application. Examination of the claims is respectfully requested in view of the amendments to the claims and the following remarks.

I. The § 101 Rejections

Claims 1, 14, and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

In particular, the Examiner notes that the claims do not address what would happen is the conditional statement (in the claims) is not met, and that the claims should produce a concrete, useful, or tangible result.

Applicant has amended each of the claims to address what would happen if the conditional statement in the claims were not met, in addition to providing a concrete result – e.g., responsive to the first transaction message *not having a dependency on the preceding non-completed transaction, applying the row change associated with the first transaction message to the table copy* at the target node without holding the first transaction message. That is, the concrete result includes applying the row change associated with the first transaction message to the table copy, which applying corresponds to “storing a result”.

Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests withdrawal of the § 101 rejections to the claims.

II. The § 112 Rejections

Claims 1, 14, and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being

indefinite.

With respect to claims 1, 14, and 27 (and dependents where applicable) the Examiner notes that there is no transition in the claims from an “incomplete message” to a “complete message”. Applicant has amended the claims to include a transition in the claims, for example, claim 1 now recites “responsive to completing the preceding non-completed transaction message...”.

With respect to claim 14 (and its dependent claims), the Examiner asserts that there is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim since the specification does not provide any basis for a computer readable medium.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner’s assertion that the term “computer readable medium” needs to be taught in the specification. One of skill in the art will readily understand the meaning and scope of the term “computer readable medium.” Further, “computer readable medium” claims are recognized as an accepted type of claim, similar to “method,” “system,” and “device” claims. Specifically, MPEP § 2106 states:

[A] claimed computer-readable medium encoded with a computer program is a computer element which defines structural and functional interrelationships between the computer program and the rest of the computer which permit the computer program’s functionality to be realized, and is thus statutory.

(M.P.E.P. § 2106.IV.B.1(a), 8th ed., 4th rev.)

Therefore, based at least on the reasons above, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the § 112 rejections to claims 1, 14, and 27 (and the claims that depend therefrom).

Should any unresolved issues remain, Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,
SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'Kel. VB', with a horizontal line extending to the right.

March 22, 2007
Date

Kelvin M. Vivian
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 53,727
(650) 475-1448